

Applicant : Parent et al.
Serial No. : 09/965,117
Filed : September 26, 2001
Page : 10 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-471001 / P435

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 were pending, of which 1, 14, 19, 20, 21, and 22 have independent form. The claims stand rejected. The applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 10, 14, 21, 22, and 27 and canceled claims 19 and 20. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at least at pages 6, 7, 10, and 11. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendment and following remarks.

Section 112 Rejections

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. However, the amended claim 14 no longer includes the term objected to by the Examiner, and the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is moot.

Section 103 Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,778,359 to Stent ("Stent") in view of Bjorn E. Backlund, OOE: A Compound Document Framework ("Backlund"). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In order to expedite prosecution, however, the applicant amended claim 1, which now recites a method that includes "generating packing data that describes the characteristics of the foreign data block . . . , wherein generating packing data includes selecting, based on the character encoding format of the foreign data block, a byte pattern that indicates a presence of a header, and including the byte pattern in the packing data."

The applicant respectfully submits that neither Stent nor Backlund discloses or suggests the limitations at issue. Stent discloses a system and method for automatically determining a file record format. *See* Abstract. A typical file is a database file 16, which can include a header 30 which contains information about the contents of the file. After the header begins the main body 32, which comprises one or more file records. Each record includes a number of

Applicant : Parent et al.
Serial No. : 09/965,117
Filed : September 26, 2001
Page : 11 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-471001 / P435

different fields. Each field is designated to contain a predetermined data type. The file 16 ends with a trailer 34. *See* col. 3, lines 49-56. Stent discloses skipping the header and analyzing the main body in order to determine record format. *See* col. 5, lines 18-23. One way to skip the header is to search at the beginning of the file for the word "HEADER" and then skipping over the portion of the file between the word "HEADER" and a subsequent carriage return or line feed. *See* col. 5, lines 12-18. However, Stent does not teach that the word "HEADER" was selected based on the character encoding format of the foreign data block, as required by claim 1. Moreover, the word "HEADER" does not specify a byte pattern, which claim 1 requires, because there are different byte patterns that can represent this word. Thus, Stent does not disclose or suggest the claim 1 limitations at issue.

The Examiner recognizes that Backlund does not disclose or suggest the claim 1 limitations at issue, which the applicant respectfully submits is the case. As neither Stent nor Backlund discloses or suggests the claim 1 limitations at issue, the applicant respectfully submits that their combination, assuming that there is motivation for such a combination, also does not disclose or suggest the claim 1 limitations at issue. For at least this reason, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims depending from claim 1 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,826,597 to Lonnroth et al. ("Lonnroth"). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In order to expedite prosecution, however, to the applicant amended claim 14, which now recites a computer program product that includes instructions to "search for a header that indicates the beginning of an embedded foreign data block packet . . . , wherein searching for the header comprises: scanning byte by byte for a byte pattern that represents a presence of a header; and when the byte pattern is found, determine a character encoding format of the header and scan character by character using the character encoding format to search for the identifier, and, if the identifier is found, process the header or, if an identifier is not found, scan a remaining portion of

Applicant : Parent et al.
Serial No. : 09/965,117
Filed : September 26, 2001
Page : 12 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-471001 / P435

the host data file byte by byte for the byte pattern." Claim 14 also recites that the identifier is included in the header.

The applicant respectfully submits that neither Stent nor Backlund discloses or suggests the claim 14 limitations at issue. As discussed above, Stent discloses searching for the word "HEADER." However, as discussed forth above, this word does not specify a byte pattern, and searching for this word, hence, does not constitute a disclosure or suggestion of scanning byte by byte for a byte pattern, as recited by claim 14. Moreover, Stent does not disclose that when the byte pattern is found, a character encoding format of the header is determined and the identifier included in the header is searched for by scanning character by character using the character encoding format, as required by claim 14. Indeed, Stent expressly discloses that the header is skipped when found. Thus, Stent does not disclose or suggest the claim 14 limitation at issue.

The Examiner recognizes that Lonnroth does not disclose or suggest the claim 14 limitations at issue, which the applicant respectfully submits is the case. As neither Stent nor Backlund discloses or suggests the claim 14 limitations at issue, the applicant respectfully submits that their combination, assuming that there is motivation for such a combination, also does not disclose or suggest the claim 14 limitations at issue. For at least this reason, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 and claims depending from claim 14 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Backlund in view of Stent. The applicant canceled without prejudice claims 19 and 20.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Backlund in view of Stent. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In order to expedite prosecution, however, the applicant amended claim 21, which now recites a computer program product that includes instructions to "generate information that describes the characteristics of the foreign data block, including information identifying the beginning and end of the foreign data block and further including an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file, wherein generating information identifying the beginning of the foreign data block includes selecting, based on the character

Applicant : Parent et al.
Serial No. : 09/965,117
Filed : September 26, 2001
Page : 13 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-471001 / P435

encoding format, a byte pattern that indicates a presence of the information marking the beginning of the foreign data block.”

The Examiner recognizes that Backlund does not disclose the claim 21 limitations at issue but contends that Stent does. For at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that Stent does not disclose or suggest the claim 21 limitations at issue and that claim 21 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Backlund in view of Stent. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In order to expedite prosecution, however, to the applicant amended claim 22, which now recites a computer program product that includes instructions to “generate information that describes the characteristics of the metadata, including information identifying the beginning and end of the metadata and further including an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file, wherein generating information identifying the beginning of the metadata includes selecting, based on the character encoding format, a byte pattern that indicates a presence of the information marking the beginning of the metadata.”

The Examiner recognizes that Backlund does not disclose the claim 22 limitations at issue but contends that Stent does. For at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that Stent does not disclose or suggest the claim 22 limitations at issue and that claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview held on November 21, 2005. Examiner Michael Meucci and the applicant's representative, Tim H. Pham, participated. The participants discussed claims 1 and 14 in view of the Stent, Backlund, and Lonnroth references.

Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly

Applicant : Parent et al.
Serial No. : 09/965,117
Filed : September 26, 2001
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-471001 / P435

addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 21, 2005

Tim H. Pham
Reg. No. 48,589

Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50296229.doc

BEST AVAILABLE COPY